

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 262 474

EA 018 024

AUTHOR Kerrins, Judith A.
TITLE Inservice Training Needs of School Board Members as Perceived by School Board Members and School Superintendents in the State of Colorado.
PUB DATE Mar 85
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of School Administrators (117th, Dallas, TX, March 8-11, 1985).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *Boards of Education; Elementary Secondary Education; *Inservice Education; Predictor Variables; State Surveys; Superintendents
IDENTIFIERS *Board of Education Members; Colorado

ABSTRACT

Approximately 500 Colorado school board members and school superintendents responded to a 1983 questionnaire that sought to determine the extent to which a need for inservice training for school board members was perceived as important. Of 67 skills or areas of knowledge listed in the questionnaire, the board members identified 20 as fairly important or necessary. Of the five subject areas into which the 67 items were subdivided, the area of "Role and Responsibility" was considered most vital. Superintendents agreed with the board members in a priority given to each of the five subject areas, but disagreed concerning the extent to which training was needed. The types of population served by the boards (urban, suburban, isolated city, rural mountainous, or rural agricultural) did not affect the findings, nor did the board members' sex or years of experience on a board. The board members' income levels and educational levels did affect their perceptions of training needs. Of the 14 training methods listed in the questionnaire, 13 were identified as having been used in at least one of the 107 districts surveyed. Discussions with superintendents and with other board members were perceived as the two most effective methods for inservice training. (PGD)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED262474

INSERVICE TRAINING NEEDS OF SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS
AS PERCEIVED BY SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS AND
SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS IN THE STATE
OF COLORADO

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*Judith
Kerrins*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A paper presented at the Annual Meeting
American Association of School Administrators
Dallas, Texas
March, 1985

by

Judith A. Kerrins, Ph.D.
Superintendent of Schools
Teller County School District Re-2
Woodland Park, Colorado

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA 018 024

INSERVICE TRAINING NEEDS OF SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS
AS PERCEIVED BY SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS AND
SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS IN THE STATE
OF COLORADO

The future of America is directly dependent upon the quality of its citizenry which, in the long run, is determined by the quality of the education they receive in the public schools for whose operation the school boards are legally responsible. (Tuttle, 1963, p.16)

IDENTIFICATION OF THE PROBLEM

Today, public school systems, and therefore boards of education, are confronted with highly emotional, highly political issues...and therefore, board decisions are affected by this problematic environment. Indeed, this tumultuous environment both shapes and impinges upon a school board's functioning. (Cistone, 1978; Foster, 1975) (p.3)

Often school board members are elected with little preparation or training for their role as members of a board of education...the discrepancy between their expectations and the reality of the role often lead to frustration for individual board members and administrators, and to confusion regarding the mission, direction, priorities, or commitment of the local board of education.

In a paper presented at the National School Board Convention in 1980, Fletcher listed several board members' grievances, including the following:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1. A significant amount of time is spent listening to the public and staff and arguing amongst ourselves. We think we have set a policy and then find that few people have knowledge of the policy and things go on the same as before.
2. We never seem to know what's happening until the press calls requesting information or a statement. The superintendent's response is that he is trying to protect us.
3. We are snowed under by paperwork and still don't know what's going on in the district.
4. We spend hours talking about details which don't relate to kids.
5. We never know what a decision will cost, or how it will impact upon a school. Fletcher, 1980, p.51

To compound these problems, the release of such reports as the Commission on Excellence's A Nation at Risk, which alleges that the American public schools are doing a less than adequate job of educating young people, places additional pressures on boards of education and many times increases the confusion of many board members.

Talk of nationalized testing or a standardized curriculum addresses the issue of local control -- and though many Americans question (doubt) the quality of education offered in today's public schools, most are also unwilling to give up local control to a state or national agency.

Thus we have a highly political and emotional situation where decisions are made by (usually) untrained personnel, and then later the quality of those decisions is questioned.

BEST COPY

Recognizing that if local control is to be effective and sound decisions which positively impact education are to be made, some training is required, the State of Kentucky (recently) passed a law requiring public school board members to receive 15 clock hours of inservice training per year. Kentucky is the first state to pass such a law (I believe Texas and one of the Carolinas may now have a similar law), and, at least it is a start!!

PURPOSE/RATIONALE OF THE STUDY

Given the consensus that board members need training in order to more effectively and efficiently perform their jobs, the following questions arise:

1. What kind of training do board members need?
2. Do all board members need the same kind (and amount) of training?
3. What kind of training is preferred (and, therefore, implicitly used)?

It would seem to me if we could find the answers to these questions, we could design a training program for school board members which could increase their effectiveness and possibly lessen their frustrations!

REVIEW OF PERTINENT LITERATURE

One method of seeking answers to those questions is to review the literature, hoping to find both opinion (preferably expert opinion) and research data which might provide insight into answers or into a design which would enable one to collect data, analyze it, and in that way identify answers.

In reviewing the literature, 5 categories were identified:

The Role and Responsibilities of Members of School District Boards of Education

In Colorado, Colorado School Laws, 1978, Article 32, enumerates Colorado School District Board Powers and Duties. The article identifies specific powers and duties and then provides for general powers and duties stating, "...such board of education shall possess all powers delegated to a board of education or to a school district by law and shall perform all duties required by law" (Colorado School Laws, 1978, p.2-3).

While some powers and duties are identified by law, the board is also confronted with the local citizens who may have different expectations.

Educational experts have identified lists of board members' roles including:

1. Promoters of the public interest in education.
2. Defenders and upholders of community values.
3. An appellate body to hear complaints.
4. Supervisors of personnel.
5. Conservator of resources.
6. Promoters of individual rights and interests.

Goldhammer, 1967, p.11-12.

As early as 1948, Douglass and Orledor identified three areas of emphasis: "planning, legislation and appraisal, evaluation" (p.16).

While the functions of a school board member may be identified and delineated in a generalized manner, the responsibilities of a board of education are not well discerned by the local citizenry. In many communities, individuals or groups have unrealistic expectations and make unrealistic demands of their local board of education. In an analysis of the popular view regarding the responsibilities of local boards, Bendiner (1962) wrote,

Of all the agencies devised by Americans for the guiding of their public affairs, few are as vague in function as the school board; fewer still take office in such resounding apathy -- and none other, ironically, is capable of stirring up the passions of the community in so fine a froth...for the school board is really neither legislative nor administrative in function, and only in a most limited way is it judicial...it is local philosopher, it is watchdog, and it is whipping boy. (Bendiner, 1969, p.3)

The School Board Member: A Profile

Profiles of school board members are readily available today. One of the first, and better known profiles, was done by Mark Hurwitz (1971), who studied the personal characteristics and attitudes of New Jersey board members. He reported that New Jersey board members

(1) are predominately married, male Caucasians in their middle forties who prefer the Republican party and the Protestant religion; (2) are predominately college graduates with a median income of \$19,000 who are engaged in white collar and professional occupations; and (3) devote 17.45 hours per month to their school board duties, have served an average of 3.97 years on their board, and consider themselves neutral on a liberal-conservative scale (Hurwitz, 1971, p.90).

The January 1985 American School Board Journal, contains the Seventh Annual Survey of Board Members which establishes an up-to-date profile of the average board member. The journal identifies the "typical" board member

BEST COPY

as a white male between the ages of 41 and 50 who is married and has children in the public schools. A college graduate, he holds a professional or managerial position and earns a family income of from \$30,000-\$40,000. He was elected to his position on the school board between four and seven years ago and at that time had no previous board experience.

Not much appears to have changed since 1971.

Characteristics and Qualities of Effective School Board Members

An official pronouncement of the National School Board Association on September 1, 1961, written by Edward M. Tuttle identified several qualities of school board members and summarized

Above all, members of Boards of Education should be men and women who hold universal public education in greatest esteem; who believe that America's future rests primarily on the superior development -- physical, mental, moral, spiritual -- of our children and youth for personal, social, economic, and civic competence; and who will work unremittingly to provide, defend, and support the highest degree of public education which their respective communities can be persuaded to demand. (Tuttle, 1963, p.276.)

Almost every state school board association handbook delineates the specific qualifications deemed essential for "effective" school board members. Most educators agree that board members should be of high moral and ethical character with a strong value and belief system. At the same time, they should be open, receptive, and encouraging of new ideas and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

innovations, willing to listen and discuss, fair minded, and knowledgeable in a variety of managerial areas (in particular budgetary areas). Perhaps most important, effective board members should be highly conscientious people whose emphasis on what is good for the students is given foremost consideration when making decisions. (Note that the qualities that many educators identify are lofty ideals, with budgetary knowledge being the most concrete and most frequently identified quality.)

The Need for Inservice Training Programs

The need for inservice training programs for school board members is identified by many groups. It can be inferred from national polls (Jones, 1973; Lutz, 1976) which suggest that Americans have lost confidence in their local boards of education, and which give less than superior ratings to the public schools for the job they are doing of educating young people.

Board members themselves report an overwhelming sense of awe as their roles become better understood. Jones (1973) reported the following confessions of a veteran New Jersey school board member:

During my first few months at the board table, I was worse off than an untrained army recruit sent straight to the front lines of a battle. Why? Because I lacked the necessary training. I should have been sent first to some sort of boot camp for new school board members. Back then ten years ago I would have said that it takes one year for a new board member to get oriented. Now I'd say it takes three or four. (Jones, 1971, p.21)

In 1971 Francois conducted a study which indicated the majority of new school board members had not been trained well -- if at all -- to assume their duties. He found that the average training program consisted of receiving reading materials (such as board policy guides, school regulations, and minutes of previous board meetings) and having a discussion with the superintendent.

A survey conducted by Coleman in 1971 in Tennessee indicated 90% of the respondents felt school board members should participate in inservice training sessions following their election or appointment to the school board.

In 1974 Calloway conducted a study of which 95.7% of the board members and professional educators surveyed stated that there was a need for pre-service and inservice training of board members.

Further, the American Association of School Administrators Commission on Inservice Education for School Administration (1961) noted that inservice education for professional staff is not enough, stating

The Board of Education carries heavy responsibilities; much depends upon what it does; and for this reason, if for no other, the board itself should seriously engage in an inservice program designed to bring clearer vision and better understanding to bear on shaping policy and to give direction to the total educational program. (AASA, 1961, p.112)

BEST COPY

The Extent to Which Existing Inservice Is Meeting Needs

Inservice training for school board members tends to be informal, sporadic, and nonsystematic. Across the United States programs vary on a state-by-state basis, with the continuum of training services ranging from individual sessions with boards, to regional workshops, to state and national conventions. Generally, training occurs in one of the following ways: (1) from the school superintendent, (2) sponsored by the state school board association, or (3) sponsored by the State Department of Education.

Superintendents are often seen as having the first line of responsibility for orientation of school board members (Garman, phone conversation, May 1981). Usually this consists of information on how things have been done or are being done in the district. The usual method is to provide board members with reading materials and hope they get read!

Because state school board associations' primary constituents are school board members, state associations assume a major role in providing board member inservice training. However, due to differences in funding and staff allocation, training varies significantly from state to state.

The National School Board Association is also disseminating a training program developed by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory in consultation with State School Board Associations in their area. It is possibly the best example of an already existing program based on a needs assessment and has received favorable comments from board members in the field (Garman, phone conversation, May 1981).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

State Departments of Education often provide training in conjunction with School Board Associations through joint sponsorships of workshops or conferences. In addition, state department personnel are usually available to attend local school board meetings and to provide suggestions and feedback when requested to do so.

However, what appears to not have been done prior to organizing and scheduling workshops and conferences is to determine congruence between training needs as identified by school board members and school superintendents. Further, present training does not appear to be tailored to meet the individual characteristics or needs of school board members.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Research Questions

The major focus of this study was to identify school board member training needs and preferred delivery systems as perceived by school board members and superintendents in the State of Colorado and secondly, to identify differences in perceived training needs based on certain demographic characteristics. The following research questions were investigated:

1. What specific areas of knowledge or skills which may be provided in training programs do school board members perceive to be most important in performing their duties?
2. What specific areas of knowledge or skills which may be provided in training programs do superintendents perceive to be the most important for school board members in performing their duties?

3. Do school board members and superintendents differentially perceive school board member training needs?
4. Do differences in perceived need exist between:
 - (a) rural, isolated city, suburban, and urban school board members,
 - (b) male and female school board members,
 - (c) members with different levels of income,
 - (d) members with different levels of education,
 - (e) members with different years of school board service?
5. What delivery methods for school board training programs have been used? What is the delivery method for school board inservice training programs as preferred by school board members and superintendents?

Questionnaire Development

Development of the questionnaire involved a careful review of the literature. Items were generated for the questionnaire if they occurred repeatedly in the literature and were identified by board members or by educators as important or critical for board member knowledge or skills to function effectively in their role. In addition, a panel was requested to review the items for validity and to make recommendations regarding the content and design of the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was divided into three parts. Part I dealt with content items for school board member inservice training. In this section participants were asked to identify those areas of knowledge or skills which

they believed most important in performing their duties as a school board member according to a five point scale, where "one" represented an item determined to be unnecessary or unimportant, and "five" represented an item necessary and essential. Altogether 67 items were presented for individual ratings. The 67 items were divided into five subsections including (1) Board of Education: Role and Responsibilities, (2) Business Services, Equipment, and Operations, (3) School District Personnel, (4) Curriculum, Programs and Special Services, and (5) Current Issues. While the initial placement of items into these categories was based on the literature review and verified by expert opinion (Validation Committee members), it was also verified by a Pearson correlation matrix, with sixty-four of the sixty-seven items correlating most highly with the scale of which it was a component.

Part II of the questionnaire dealt with delivery methods for school board inservice training programs. It contained two subsections -- one addressing methods of school board member training presently in use and their perceived effectiveness and one requesting identification of those methods believed to be most effective for school board member inservice training. While school board members and superintendents might not be as knowledgeable about the best training methods as they were about content items, the purpose of the questionnaire was to determine what their perceptions were regarding effective training.

Part III collected some demographic data about school board members and school superintendents. These data provide a profile of Colorado school board members and superintendents.

BEST COPY

The questionnaire was color-coded when it was printed in order to facilitate the sorting of returned questionnaires.

A cover letter explaining the purpose of the questionnaire was sent to each person who received the questionnaire. In addition a letter from Dr. Calvin Frazier, Colorado Commissioner of Education, in support of the survey and the potential usefulness of the resultant data accompanied the questionnaire.

Selection of the Sample

The population for this study was members of boards of education and superintendents in the State of Colorado. Based on recommendations from personnel at the Laboratory for Educational Research at the University of Colorado, Boulder, all school board members and all superintendents of schools of public school districts in the State of Colorado identified in this study as urban, suburban, isolated city and rural mountainous were surveyed. Superintendents and board members from 25 of the school districts identified as rural agricultural were surveyed. This number was recommended by personnel of the Laboratory for Educational Research in order to obtain a sample of comparable size to districts identified as isolated city and rural mountainous. There, 25 districts were systematically selected from a list of districts classified by the Colorado Department of Education as Rural Agriculture. All classification definitions were taken from an information booklet published by the Colorado Department of Education, Office of Management Services. A list of school board members was obtained from the Colorado Association of School Boards, and a list of superintendents from the Colorado Department of Education.

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

The questionnaire was mailed to 611 school board members and 107 school superintendents in late November of 1983, with a follow-up letter sent three weeks later encouraging nonrespondents to complete and return the questionnaire. A phone call was made three weeks later to board members and superintendents who had still not returned the survey.

In all, 507 questionnaires were received from school board members and superintendents, resulting in a return rate of 70.6%. Four-hundred ninety-five (495) of these contained usable data. Altogether, there was a 68.24% response rate for school board members and a 72.8% return rate for superintendents.

The data were analyzed at the University of Colorado, Boulder, Computer Center using the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) program. The data were processed for each of the research questions as follows:

1. Responses were tabulated by subsection and by item to obtain a mean response. Means were compared to determine a rank order listing of training needs as perceived by school board members.
2. Responses were tabulated by subsection and by item to obtain a mean response. Means were compared to determine a rank order listing of training needs as perceived by school superintendents.
3. Subsections were tabulated and a one-way ANOVA was run by subsection to identify any significant variance in responses between school board members and school superintendents.

4. Five one-way ANOVA's were run to test research question number 4. In each ANOVA the demographic characteristic (area of residence, sex, levels of income, levels of education, years of school board experience) was the independent variable and the responses to the questionnaire were the dependent variable.
5. Responses to preferences regarding delivery method were tabulated and means were compared in order to determine a rank order listing of preferences.

FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS

Statistical Data Regarding the Research Instrument

Before data analysis was begun, it was important to verify the reliability of the instrument, which was determined by running an Alpha test. Reliability co-efficients for each of the five scales were recorded as follows:

- Role and Responsibility, Alpha = .926
- Business Services/Equipment/Operation, Alpha = .871
- School District Personnel, Alpha = .868
- Curriculum/Programs/Special Services, Alpha = .909
- Current Issues, Alpha = .867

It was also important to attempt to identify response bias which may have occurred based on prompting (the second mailing and phone call follow-ups to nonrespondents), therefore, the nonprompted returns (315) were kept separate from the prompted responses (180). ANOVA's were run for each set of data in order to compare differences in responses, as well as a combined run for all data. In only one area, Current Issues by Years of Formal Schooling, was the outcome influenced by the prompted group. Thus, prompted results increased the power of the reported ANOVA by increasing the number of respondents in the study without changing ANOVA results.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Results Related to Research Question One

1. What specific areas of knowledge or skills (which may be provided in training programs) do school board members perceive to be most important in performing their duties?

Twenty of the sixty-seven items had tabulated means in the "fairly important" to "necessary-essential" range, with the greatest number of these related to school board member role and responsibility. In addition, mean responses tabulated by sub-section suggest that school board members perceived the area of school board member Role and Responsibility as most important in performing their duties.

TABLE 1
SKILLS OR KNOWLEDGE IMPORTANT IN PERFORMING
DUTIES AS A SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER BY
SUBSECTION AS PERCEIVED BY
COLORADO SCHOOL BOARD
MEMBERS

Subsection Area	Mean	Standard Deviation
Role and Responsibility	61.60	11.57
School District Personnel	52.11	9.13
Current Issues	51.79	10.24
Curriculum/Programs/ Special Services	46.83	9.61
Business Services	37.20	7.38

Results Related to Research Question Two

2. What specific areas of knowledge or skills (which may be provided in training programs) do superintendents perceive to be the most important for school board members in performing their duties?

Mean response scores indicated that the area of Board Member Role and Responsibility was perceived by superintendents as most important. Of the first ten rank-order items, eight dealt with Role and Responsibility, the remaining two dealt with the area of School District Personnel, but more specifically with the Selection of and Duties of the Superintendent. When comparing mean responses by subsection, school board members and superintendents agree in the rank order importance of all subset scales.

TABLE 2
SKILLS OR KNOWLEDGE IMPORTANT IN PERFORMING
DUTIES AS A SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER BY
SUBSECTION AS PERCEIVED BY
COLORADO SCHOOL
SUPERINTENDENTS

Subsection Area	Mean	Standard Deviation
Role and Responsibility	64.79	8.61
School District Personnel	50.05	7.89
Current Issues	50.02	9.84
Curriculum/Programs/ Special Services	41.83	9.61
Business Services	34.79	6.06

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Results Related to Research Question Three

3. Do school board members and superintendents differentially perceive school board member training needs?

In a rank order comparison of subtest means both school board members and school superintendents identified the same ordering of subtest scales with respect to school board member training needs. However, a one-way ANOVA identified significant differences (at the .05 level) in three of the five subsections. Areas of significant differences in perceived training needs included Role and Responsibility, $F(1,493) = 5.02, p,.05$, Business Services, $F(1,493) = 7.37, p,.05$, and Curriculum/Programs/Special Services, $F(1,493) = 18.20, p,.05$. In these three areas perceived differences between school board members and school superintendents could not be accounted for by chance.

Results Related to Research Question Four

4. Do differences in perceived need exist between

(a) rural, isolated city, suburban, and urban school board members,

(b) male and female school board members,

(c) members with different levels of income,

(d) members with different levels of education,

(e) members with different years of school board experience.

(a) Four hundred seventeen (417) responses from school board members were received for statistical processing. The return rate by location was as follows:

<u>Location</u>	<u>Return Rate</u>	<u>% of Sample</u>
Urban	71.87%	11.03%
Suburban	70.73%	13.9%
Isolated City	72.76%	37.17%
Rural Mountainous	67.24%	18.70%
Rural Agricultural	68.82%	19.18%

A one-way ANOVA was run for each of the five subsections using location as the independent variable and response to the questionnaire items as the dependent variable. Findings indicated that differences in perceptions of training needs could not be accounted for by areas in which school board members resided.

(b) A one-way ANOVA was run for each of the five subsections using sex as the independent variable and responses to the questionnaire items as the dependent variable. Findings indicate that differences in responses to questionnaire items could not be accounted for by the sex of the school board member.

(c) A one-way ANOVA was run for each of the five subsections using levels of income as the independent variable and responses to the questionnaire items as the dependent variable. Income levels were divided into ten subsets:

- 1) Under \$10,000 (n=8)
- 2) \$10-15,000 (n=22)
- 3) \$15-20,000 (n=36)
- 4) \$20-25,000 (n=51)
- 5) \$25-30,000 (n=79)

BEST COPY

- (6) \$30-35,000 (n=39)
- (7) \$35-40,000 (n=46)
- (8) \$40-45,000 (n=16)
- (9) \$45-50,000 (n=25)
- (10) above \$50,000 (n=87)

Results indicate three areas in which training needs were perceived differently based on school board members' levels of income. These areas were Business Services, $F(9,369)=2.74$, $p<.05$; School District Personnel, $F(9,369)=2.23$, $p<.05$; and Curriculum/Programs/Special Services, $F(9,369)=1.91$, $p<.05$. The Scheffe method of multiple comparisons was run in order to identify significant differences in cell means. The data suggest that members of group 1 (those respondents whose income was less than \$10,000) were outside the range established by the Scheffe.

TABLE 5
AN ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER
TRAINING NEEDS AS PERCEIVED BY COLORADO
SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO HAVE
VARYING LEVELS OF INCOME

Main Effects by Income					
DF Between 9					
DF Within 369					
Scale	Sum of Squares		Mean Squares		F-Ratio
	Between	Within	Between	Within	
Role and Responsibility	1688.127	46985.878	187.569	127.333	1.47
Business Services	1129.421	17777.338	125.158	48.177	2.74**
School District Personnel	1505.019	27559.418	167.224	74.686	2.23**
Curriculum/Programs/ Special Services	1402.571	30093.529	155.841	81.554	1.91**
Current Issues	1501.583	35293.487	166.853	95.546	1.74
** significant at .05 level					

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(d) A one-way ANOVA was run for each of the five subsections using levels of education as the independent variable and responses to questionnaire items as the dependent variable. Levels of Education as it was identified on the questionnaire included seven categories ranging from "1-8 years" to "Doctoral Degree". Because only 1 respondent indicated he had 1-8 years of formal schooling, he was included with group 2 for statistical analysis purposes. Groups were identified as follows: Group 2, 1-12 years (n=50); group 3, some college (n=117); group 4, 4-year degree (n=106); group 5, some graduate school (n=54); group 6, Masters Degree (n=52); group 7, Doctoral Degree, (n=17). Results indicated that four areas of questionnaire subtest items were significant at the .05 confidence level. These areas were Role and Responsibility, $F(5,410)=3.76$, $p<.05$, Business Services, $F(5,410)=8.8$, $p<.05$, Curriculum/Programs/Special Services, $F(5,410)=5.14$, $p<.05$, and Current Issues, $F(5,410)=1.24$, $p<.05$. The Scheffe method of multiple comparisons was run in order to compare significant differences in all means for significant ANOVA's. Results of the Scheffe indicate that groups 2 (1-12 years of schooling) and 3 (some college) responded differently than group 7 (Doctoral degree). In addition, group 2 (1-12 years of schooling) responded differently than group 6 (Masters degree) in the areas of Role and Responsibility, Business Services, and Curriculum/Programs/Special Services. In general, it appears that the less education board members have, the more importantly they perceive training needs in each of these areas.

BEST COPY

TABLE 7
AN ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SCHOOL BOARD MEMBER
TRAINING NEEDS AS PERCEIVED BY COLORADO
SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS WHO HAD
DIFFERENT LEVELS OF
EDUCATION

Main Effects by Years of Formal School
DF Between 5
DF Within 410

Scale	Sum of Squares		Mean Squares		F-Ratio
	Between	Within	Between	Within	
Role and Responsibility	2444.8	53303.6	488.9	130.0	3.761**
Business Services	2198.7	20469.6	439.75	49.92	8.808**
School District Personnel	843.4	33907.1	168.7	82.7	2.040
Curriculum/Programs/ Special Services	2263.5	36088.6	452.6	88.02	5.143**
Current Issues	1609.9	42003.2	321.9	102.4	3.143**

** significant at .05 level

(e) A one-way ANOVA was run for each of the five subtest scales using years of school board experience as the independent variable and responses to the questionnaire items as the dependent variable. Years of school board experience were divided into six groups, with group 1 representing members with 1-2 years of experience (n=10); group 2, 2-3 years experience (n=7); group 3, 3-5 years experience (n=100); group 4, 6-8 years experience (n=40); group 5, 9-11 years experience (n=31); and group 6, 11-33 years experience (n=22). Results indicate no statistically significant differences in perceived training needs based on years of experience as a school board member.

Results Related to Research Question Five

5. What delivery methods for school board training programs have been used? What is the delivery method of choice for school board inservice training programs as preferred by school board members and school superintendents?

Thirteen of the fourteen methods listed in the survey were identified as having been used in one or another of the 107 districts surveyed; however, 12.2% of the board members who participated in this study stated no training had ever been offered or provided. The only method not identified as used for school board member training was computer instruction. Means for the perceived effectiveness ("1" representing "ineffective" and "4" representing "very effective") of each method are listed in rank order in Table 4. Discussion with the superintendent and discussions with other board members were perceived as the two most effective methods for board member inservice training.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 9
RANK ORDER OF PERCEIVED EFFECTIVENESS OF SCHOOL
BOARD MEMBER TRAINING METHODS

Method	Mean	Standard Deviation
1. Discussion with the superintendent	3.424	.878
2. Discussion with other board members	3.331	.937
3. Conferences sponsored by state school board association	2.988	1.063
4. Discussions with district personnel other than the superintendent	2.978	1.132
5. A tour of district facilities	2.877	1.205
6. Special training with my board	2.489	1.620
7. Journal articles	2.463	1.421
8. Attend a board meeting prior to assuming office	2.33	1.265
9. National level conferences and workshops	2.180	1.443
10. Reading previous board minutes	2.216	1.187
11. Visits by and discussions with state department officials	2.212	1.405
12. AV material	2.061	1.196
13. Computer instruction	1.584	1.353

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Profile of Colorado School Board Members

Demographic data was summarized in order to provide a profile of Colorado school board members. The majority of Colorado school board members are male (69%), Caucasians, between the ages of 36 and 45 who are better educated than the general public and who report an average income in the \$25,000 to \$35,000 range. Most board members have lived in their community for at least 10 years; however, most are serving their first term on a school board of education.

A Profile of Colorado School Superintendents

Colorado school superintendents are most often married, male, Caucasians, 45 to 55 years old who had either a Masters or Doctoral degree. Their average income was between \$35,000 and \$40,000. They have resided in their community an average of ten years and have been the superintendent for almost eight years.

Implications

Many of the findings of this study support the literature review and expert opinion with respect to the need for inservice training programs for board members if they are to function effectively and efficiently in their position.

If states are to pass laws modeled after Kentucky's requirement for board member inservice training (15 clock hours per year), it behooves public education to assure that such training meets identified needs of participating board members.

It is therefore recommended that board training sessions and discussions be planned based on Needs Assessment information and further that they be evaluated to assure adequate follow-up. Local board of education should prioritize their own training needs and an inservice training plan should be implemented and evaluated to assure each board member the opportunity to gain the skills and knowledge necessary in performing their jobs. Further, training should be held on a regular basis for board members. While such training should include areas in which board members believe they lack important skills and knowledge, it should also focus on the developmental aspects of improving board member skills and increasing their knowledge.

State school board associations should sponsor training workshops at a regional level through the state, and at such a time so as to not always conflict with regular work hours.

Where there are board members with fewer years of education or experience in an educational system, more opportunities for discussions and training sessions should be available. These discussions and training sessions should focus on Role and Responsibility, Business Services, Curriculum/Programs/Special Services, and Current Issues.

REFERENCES

- American Association of School Administrators. Inservice Education for School Administration. Washington, D.C., American Association of School Administrators, 1963, 112 pp.
- Bendiner, Robert. The Politics of Schools: A Crisis in Self Government. New York, Harper and Row, 1969. 240 pp.
- Calloway, Charles. "A Preservice and/or Inservice Training Program for Board of Education Members" (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, East Tennessee University, 1974)
- Cistone, Peter J. "School Board Members Learn Their Skills Before They Become Board Members" American School Board Journal, Vol. 165, No. 11 (January 1978), pp. 5-7.
- Coleman, Bob. "Survey of Tennessee School Boards" Tennessee School Boards Journal, Vol. 24, No. 3 (March 1973), pp. 5-7.
- Colorado School Laws, Colorado Department of Education, Denver, Colorado, 1978, 712 pp.
- Douglass, Harl R. and Calvin Grieder. American Public Education. New York, Ronald Press, 1948. 593 pp.
- Fletcher, Verna M. "Policy and Administration, Who Does What?" Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the National School Board Association (40th, San Francisco, California, April 19-22, 1980), 13 pp.
- Foster, Budi, G. Orientation and Training of School Board Members. Arlington, Virginia: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 114 930, 1975, pp. 8-10.
- Francois, John. "Better--Lots Better--Training Is Needed for New Board Members" American School Board Journal, Vol. 157, No. 7 (July 1970), pp. 9-10.
- Garman, Keats, Consultant, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Portland, Oregon. Phone conversation, May 1983. Private correspondence, June 1983.
- Goldhammer, Keith. Issues and Problems in Contemporary Educational Administration: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 014787, 1967, 215 pp.
- "Heads up; Professionally and financially, you're better off than before." American School Board Journal. Vol. 172, No. 1 (January 1985), p. 29.

- Hurwitz, Mark W. "The Personal Characteristics and Attitudes of New Jersey School Board Members" (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Temple University, 1971).
- Jones, Phillip G. "How to Train a New School Board Member and Ways to Help Seasoned Veterans Brush Up, Too". American School Board Journal, Vol. 160, No. 4 (April 1973), pp. 21-28.
- Lutz, Frank W. "Education, Public Policy, and Politics". Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the National School Board Association (36th, San Francisco, April 10-13, 1976), 13 pp.
- Tuttle, Edward M. School Board Leadership in America. Danville, Illinois, Interstate Printers & Publishers, 1963. 320 pp.